

REMARKS

Claims 9-24 are currently pending in the present application, of which Claims 12 and 20 have been amended.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 12 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for not complying with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection insofar as it might apply to the claims as amended herein.

Amended Claim 12 (and similarly Claim 20) now recites "means for incrementing said search key to a next URL data string element, in response to finding said matching pattern." Support for the claim amendments can be found on page 12, lines 6-8 of the specification. As such, the § 112 rejection is believed to be overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 9-12, 14-20 and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Guha* (US 6,539,373). Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection.

Claim 9 (and similarly Claim 17) recites "means for constructing a search key" and "means for performing a full match search within a lookup table utilizing said search key." On page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed means for constructing a search key is disclosed by *Guha* in col. 8, lines 35-60, and that the claimed means for performing a full match search utilizing the search key is disclosed by *Guha* in col. 10, lines 15-21.

In col. 8, lines 35-60, *Guha* discloses a search term 301, a primary hash function 302, a hash key 303, and a secondary hash function 304. In col. 10, lines 15-21, *Guha* discloses

The user also provides category input 603 specifying a subject category for the search. Category lookup engine 605 determines which documents in document set 602 fall within the specified category, and generates category lookup results 607. For example, if category input 603 is the

category "science/biology/zoology/mammals", results 607 include all documents falling within that category.

Assuming *arguendo* that any one of *Guha*'s search term 301, primary hash function 302, hash key 303, and secondary hash function 304 can be construed as the search key of the claimed means for constructing the search key, *Guha* still does not teach or suggest the claimed means for performing a full match search within a lookup table utilizing the search key. This is because none of search term 301, primary hash function 302, hash key 303, and secondary hash function 304 is mentioned in col. 10, lines 15-21 of *Guha*.

Claim 9 also recites "means for returning to said constructing a search key, in response to finding a matching pattern within said lookup table." On pages 3-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the claimed means for returning to said constructing a search key is disclosed by *Guha* in col. 10, lines 15-21. Since col. 10, lines 15-21 of *Guha* does not teach or suggest the search key, it is clear that col. 10, lines 15-21 of *Guha* does not teach or suggest the claimed means for returning to constructing a search key.

Because the claimed invention recites novel features that are not found in *Guha*, the § 102 rejection is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

Claims 9-24 are currently pending in the present application. For the reasons stated above, Applicants believe that independent Claims 9 and 17 along with their respective dependent claims are in condition for allowance. The remaining prior art cited by the Examiner but not relied upon has been reviewed and is not believed to show or suggest the claimed invention.

No fee or extension of time is believed to be necessary; however, in the event that any fee or extension of time is required for the prosecution of this application, please charge it against IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 50-0563.

Respectfully submitted,



Antony P. Ng
Registration No. 43,427
DILLON & YUDELL, LLP
8911 N. Cap. of Texas Hwy, suite 2110
Austin, Texas 78759
(512) 343-6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS